

To: Rob Runkel[runkel@usgs.gov]
From: Wall, Dan
Sent: Fri 9/12/2014 2:07:09 PM
Subject: RE:

thanks

-----Original Message-----

From: Rob Runkel [mailto:runkel@usgs.gov]
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2014 7:56 AM
To: Wall, Dan
Cc: Schmittiel, Paula; Way, Steven; Lewis, Brent R
Subject: RE:

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

>> Here's a revised loading table for the Oct 2012 data;
>> this is the basic information that went into the bar
>> chart from my June 2013 presentation to the stakeholders.
>> I did make one small change in the flow profile during
>> model calibration that resulted in a small increase in
>> the loads attributable to the Upper Animas. But the
>> basic findings are the same.

On Fri, 12 Sep 2014, Wall, Dan wrote:

> OK. What does this mean?
>
> "Loading analysis based on flow profile of 29 May 2014"
>
> Is that a model run date?
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Rob Runkel [mailto:runkel@usgs.gov]
> Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2014 2:59 PM
> To: Wall, Dan
> Cc: Schmittiel, Paula; Way, Steven; Lewis, Brent R
> Subject: RE:
>
>
> these are all based on flows and conc from Oct 2012.
>
>

> On Thu, 11 Sep 2014, Wall, Dan wrote:
>
>> Q for you Rob. Why did you use the flow profile from Spring for loads we measured in the Fall?
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Schmittdiel, Paula
>> Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2014 2:48 PM
>> To: Rob Runkel; Way, Steven; Wall, Dan; Lewis, Brent R
>> Subject: RE:
>>
>> Rob - I like the way you have "ginned it down" to a few key points. A couple of things if you are thinking of having the load table as a handout at the meetings - which you may or may not be thinking of doing.
>>

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

>> Thanks
>>
>> Paula Schmittdiel
>> Remedial Project Manager
>> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
>> 1595 Wynkoop St.
>> Denver, CO 80202
>> Office: 303-312-6861
>> Fax: 303-312-7151
>> Cell: 720-951-0795
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Rob Runkel [mailto:runkel@usgs.gov]
>> Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2014 2:35 PM
>> To: Way, Steven; Wall, Dan; Schmittdiel, Paula; Lewis, Brent R
>> Subject:
>>
>>
>> Dear All --
>>
>> Here's a revised loading table for the Oct 2012 data;
>> this is the basic information that went into the bar
>> chart from my June 2013 presentation to the stakeholders.
>> I did make one small change in the flow profile during
>> model calibration that resulted in a small increase in
>> the loads attributable to the Upper Animas. But the
>> basic findings are the same.
>>
>> Although the basic findings are the same, the fresh look at these
>> numbers reveals a few things that are of importance (and that perhaps
>> we already knew...). Focusing on the 4 metals that are above
>> standards all the way to A72 -- Al, Cd, Fe, and Zn -- I plan to make
>> the following points...
>>
>>
>> Al -- the top 7 loaders (84% of the load) are all downstream of Gladstone;
>> only 6.6% of the load is from above Gladstone;

>>
>> Cd -- the top 2 loaders (40% of load) are downstream of Gladstone;
>> 26% of the load is from above Gladstone;
>>
>> Fe -- the top 2 loaders (64%) are downstream of Gladstone;
>> 17.6% of the load is from above Gladstone
>>
>> Zn -- 41% of the loading is from above Gladstone, including the
>> largest loader, the Red & Bonita (19%)
>>
>> Overall the Gladstone area is an appropriate focus if you're looking at Zn; not so much for Al, Cd, and Fe.
>>
>> Mineral Creek is an important source (Al: #1 source; Cd: #2 source;
>> Fe: #2 source)
>>
>> Prospect Gulch is an important source (Al: #2; Fe: #1;).
>>
>> U. Animas is an important source (Cd: #1; Zn: #2)
>>
>> I still need to sum all the Cement loads so that I'm comparing apples and apples when looking at Mineral and U Animas.
>>
>> -- Rob
>>
>>
>> -----
>> Rob Runkel
>> Research Hydrologist
>> U.S. Geological Survey
>> runkel@usgs.gov
>> 303.541.3013
>> <http://profile.usgs.gov/runkel>
>> -----
>>
>